

# **Interview Summary**

Application No.

10/669,894

Applicant(s)

SOULE ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen-Chau N. Le

Art Unit

2876

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Uyen-Chau N. Le.

(3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Dmitry Andreev.

(4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 25 October 2007.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference

c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 77 and 86.


Identification of prior art discussed: Antognini, Barile.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☒ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

  
MICHAEL G. LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2876

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Andreev further argued that the prior art of records fails to disclose "encoding a command into the barcode symbol, which causes a reader to execute one of a plurality of file opening programs" as set forth in claim 77. Due to the disagreement of claim 86, Mr. Andreev authorized the Examiner to cancel claims 86-89 and 95 without prejudice or disclaimer by an Examiner amendment and further authorized the Examiner to amend claims 13, 47 and 52 in accordance to the discussion during the previous interview on 16 October 2007 in order to place the instant application in a proper condition for allowance.